U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management Carson City District Office

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Project Creator: Dan Erbes

Field Office: Sierra Front Field Office

Lead Office: N/A

Case File/Project Number: N/A

Applicable Categorical Exclusion (cite section): 516 DM 11.9: J.(8) Installation of minor

devices to protect human life (e.g., grates across mines).

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2012-0012-CX

Project Name: Olinghouse FY2012 AML Closures

Project Description: Target Minerals is proposing to mitigate human health and safety risks associated with 4 abandoned mine workings at the Olinghouse Mine in Washoe County. Activities will commence upon approval of this CX. Abandoned mine hazards will be backfilled and/or posted and fenced. During these proposed actions should any cultural resources be uncovered, the project would be discontinued and appropriate measures taken to ensure that all cultural resources are protected. A bat survey would be completed for all underground mine workings and any conditions revealed by that survey which warrant protective measures (i.e. bat gates) will be handled under a separate action at a later date.

Applicant Name: Nevada Division of Minerals

Project Location: Sec. 11, T. 21 N., R. 23 E. (see attached maps and feature list)

BLM Acres for the Project Area: Approximately 1 Acres

Land Use Plan Conformance (cite reference/page number): This action is in conformance with the Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan (2001) pg. MIN-1; Identify hazards to the public around inactive and active mine claims through signing, fencing or other appropriate means. Priorities for hazard reduction will be established and carried out by the minerals program, in cooperation with the State Mine Inspector and claimants.

Name of Plan: NV – Carson City RMP.

Screening of Extraordinary Circumstances: The following extraordinary circumstances apply to individual actions within categorical exclusions (43 CFR 46.215). The BLM has considered the following criteria:

(Specialist review: initial in appropriate box)

	If any question is answered 'yes' an EA or EIS must be prepared.	YES	NO
	1. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on public health or safety? (project lead/P&EC)		
	2. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on such natural resources		PZ
	and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park,		
	recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural		nc
	landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands		ADC
	(EO 11990); floodplains (EO 11988); national monuments; migratory birds (EO		RC
	13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas?		
	(wildlife biologist, hydrologist, outdoor recreation planner, archeologist)		
	3. Would the Proposed Action have highly controversial environmental effects or		
	involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources		Page
	[NEPA 102(2)(E)]? (project lead/P&EC)		1/32.
	4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant		
	environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		128
	(project lead/P&EC)		LS - C
	5. Would the Proposed Action establish a precedent for future action or represent a		
	decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental		1328
	effects? (project lead/P&EC)		1 2 2
	6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with		
	individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects?		92/3
	(project lead/P&EC)		82
	7. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on properties listed, or		0
	eligible for listing, on the NRHP as determined by the bureau or office? (archeologist)		RC
	8. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on species listed, or		PZ
	proposed to be listed, on the list of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have		
	significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species? (wildlife biologist,		51
	botanist)		
i	9. Would the Proposed Action violate federal law, or a State, local or tribal law or		CLO
	requirement imposed for the protection of the environment? (project lead/P&EC)		
	10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect		172
	on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? (project lead/P&EC)		0//
İ	11. Would the Proposed Action limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred		0
	sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely		RC
	affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 13007)? (archeologist)	····	_
	12. Would the Proposed Action contribute to the introduction, continued existence,		
	or spread of noxious weeds or non-native species known to occur in the area or		DT
	actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of		
-	such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and EO 13112)? (botanist)		

SPECIALISTS' REVIEW:

During ID Team review of the above Proposed Action and extraordinary circumstances, the following specialists reviewed this CX:

Ken Nelson, Realty Specialist
Arthur Callan, Outdoor Recreation Planner
Niki Cutler, Hydrologist
Rachel Crews, Archaeologist
Pilar Ziegler - Wildlife Biologist/BLM Sensitive Species - Wildlife
Dean Tonenna, Botanist - Natural Resource Specialist/BLM Sensitive Species - Plants
Brian Buttazoni - Planning & Environmental Coordinator

CONCLUSION: Based upon the review of this Proposed Action, I have determined that the above-described project is a categorical exclusion, in conformance with the LUP, and does not require an EA or EIS. A categorical exclusion is not subject to protest or appeal.

Approved by:

Bryan Hockett

Acting Field Manager Sierra Front Field Office Date

Olinghouse Sites Deflance WA376 WA 370 WA 374 WA 365 647 0.25 0.5 1 0 Target Sites SYSTEM OF PUBLIC LANDS Miles Bureau of Indian Affairs **Bureau of Land Management** 2-17-2010 JPT Private North American Datum Nad27